

\$100 billion in Korea, \$100 billion in South Vietnam, and further hundreds of billions protecting other dictatorships in "free" countries around the world. Or would it be cheaper in human life and dollars to spend \$5 or \$10 billion per year in a real effort to achieve some economic progress.

Instead of the CIA haunting the undergrounds of the third world, perhaps the efforts of a similar number of dedicated scholars, teachers, and technicians honestly seeking to help their people would accomplish our goals better, including our goal of getting honest information about the conditions of that world.

Only if we meet this problem squarely can be the United States play a significant role in the world today. Only by meeting it head on can we cure our schizophrenia of national purpose. The debate on Vietnam can help achieve this. But it must have a leadership it is not now receiving from the administration, the Congress, or the political hopefuls of both parties.

(Mr. BLATNIK (at the request of Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. BLATNIK'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts (at the request of Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts's remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

#### FACTS OR POWER LOBBY?

(Mr. HATHAWAY (at the request of Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues an editorial which appeared in the Waterville, Maine, Morning Sentinel on Monday, October 30.

Because the editorial states so clearly the opinion of Maine people with respect to the recent vote on the Dickey-Lincoln School hydroelectric power project, I place it in the RECORD of these proceedings:

#### FACTS OR POWER LOBBY?

There are some who will blandly say that the House of Representatives knocked funds for the Dickey-Lincoln School power project out of the appropriations bill last week for economy reasons.

This will bring wry smiles from the knowledgeable since the money for Dickey-Lincoln was but a drop in the bucket in the bill.

In fact, there are 131 other projects left in the bill which will bring the taxpayers less for their money than would Dickey-Lincoln.

Maine utilities took no open part in the Dickey-Lincoln fight this time, but U.S. Sen. Edmund S. Muskie has said that several congressmen have told him that "lobbying by

private power companies—nationwide—against Dickey-Lincoln is the most vicious they have ever been subjected to.

Thus, the hard work of Sens. Smith and Muskie and Reps. Kyros and Hathaway didn't turn the tide and Dickey-Lincoln was knocked out of the bill while other, less worthy projects were left in.

Had there been a genuine effort to really economize by knocking less worthy projects than Dickey out of the bill, one might accept economy as the reason.

But since this didn't happen, and since New England is the only region in the country without competitive public power, one has reason to suspect that Sen. Muskie may be right when he says the deletion of Dickey-Lincoln resulted from "the pressures and misrepresentations of the New England private utilities and their allies."

There is good reason to do some investigating to find out the extent of the power lobby, and its effect upon the ethics of the House.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MORRIS of New Mexico, for November 2, 1967, and November 3, 1967, on account of official business.

Mr. HELSTOSKI (at the request of Mr. MOSS), for November 1, 2, and 3, on account of official business.

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), through November 11, on account of injury.

Mr. McCULLOCH (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for today, on account of official business—National Advisory Committee on Civil Disorders.

Mr. NELSEN (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for November 3, 1967, on account of illness in the family.

Mr. PRYOR, for November 2 and November 3, on account of official business.

Mr. BURKE of Florida (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for November 3, 1967, on account of official business.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. HERLONG, for 15 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GUDE) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BUCHANAN, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. BRAY, for 30 minutes, on November 7.

Mr. BRAY, for 30 minutes, on November 8.

Mr. ASHLEY (at the request of Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana), for 1 hour, on Friday, November 3; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. BOB WILSON (at the request of

Mr. GUDE) and to include extraneous matter during general debate on S. 780.

Mr. KUPFERMAN (at the request of Mr. GUDE) and to include extraneous matter and tables during general debate on S. 780.

Mr. ICHORD and to include extraneous material.

Mr. MOSS (at the request of Mr. BLANTON) to revise and extend his remarks in the Committee and to include a letter.

Mr. HALL to extend his remarks immediately after the special order of Mr. HERLONG.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GUDE) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania in five instances.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho in five instances.

Mr. DOLE.

Mr. BRAY.

Mr. QUILLEN in four instances.

Mr. ERLÉNBERG.

Mr. MINSHALL.

Mr. DELLENBACK.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. LONG of Maryland in two instances.

Mr. MULTER in three instances.

Mr. BINGHAM in two instances.

Mr. RESNICK in two instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in two instances.

Mr. DULSKI in two instances.

Mr. REES in two instances.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas.

Mr. GILBERT.

Mr. HAWKINS.

Mr. MCCARTHY in 10 instances.

Mr. HOWARD.

Mrs. SULLIVAN in five instances.

Mr. BENNETT.

Mr. BROOKS in two instances.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida in five instances.

#### SENATE BILLS AND A CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills and a concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 6. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the initial stage of the Oahe unit, James division, Missouri River Basin project, South Dakota, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 220. An act to authorize the sale of certain public lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 876. An act relating to Federal support of education of Indian students in sectarian institutions of higher education; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1119. An act to grant minerals, including oil and gas, on certain lands in the Crow Indian Reservation, Mont., to certain Indians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1367. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to prevent terminations of oil and gas leases in cases where there is a nominal deficiency in the rental payment, and to authorize him to reinstate under some conditions oil and gas leases terminated by operation of law for failure to pay rental timely; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 2336. An act to determine the respective rights and interests of the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation, and the Yakima Tribes of Indians of the Yakima Res-

ditional negotiations" and "self-determination" for Vietnam.

You know and I know that your present course is aimed at perpetuating the present government in Saigon, with no concessions to the National Liberation Front in terms of free participation in the processes of government. You know that this amounts to calling for their unconditional surrender, since participation in the Government is what they are fighting for. Therefore you are doomed to continue this war until you achieve "unconditional surrender," or are yourself defeated.

I believe that this country would be better served if you would explain frankly that this is your goal, and why.

Most people in this country no longer believe that anything we could do in an Asian peasant country of 15 million is worth a downpayment approaching \$100 billion and 100 thousand U.S. casualties, and a long-term contract that may cost several times that. For that amount of money we could help India, which represents 90 percent of the people living under a democratic system on the Asian mainland—and nearly half of those living under democratic systems in the entire world—make herself into a model for Asian democracy, and change the course of history. We get nothing for our investment in South Vietnam except an indefinite future of trouble. In terms of serving the future of democratic governments in Asia, no worse misapplication of resources could be imagined.

So what are your reasons for seeking "unconditional surrender" in South Vietnam? Let the Congress and the American people know, so that we may debate and decide them on their merit, rather than engaging in a futile and frustrating exercise over ambiguous or meaningless phrases.

Obviously, much of the reason for your insistence on "victory" and "unconditional surrender" must come from a feeling that Vietnam is a part of the "cold war" against communism, a war this country has been waging without halt since 1945. This "cold war" syndrome led us to install Syngman Rhee as the head of an unpopular Korean Government, and refuse participation in that Government to any "left-wing" forces. This decision in 1946 precipitated the Korean war in 1950, has left a divided Korea as a festering sore on the Asian mainland, has cost us well over \$100 billion and several hundred thousand casualties in Korea. Nearly 18 years later we are still paying exorbitant amounts of U.S. taxpayers' dollars each year and keeping 50,000 U.S. troops there to prove that we won something.

The tragic aspect of all this is that we were reacting to Russian Communism in Korea, and spent all of our resources to prevent its having a major influence on a united Korea, and today we are eagerly seeking ways to extend the hand of friendship to Russia. And Russia is finding that her own overly zealous efforts to maintain by military force Communist governments on her own borders was perhaps a fruitless expenditure of resources, as more and more of these governments seek to go their own nationalist ways.

We continued the cold war by deciding to support Chiang Kai-shek on Formosa, after first deciding not to intervene in an obviously hopeless Chinese situation. Today a new generation of Americans has almost forgotten that Formosa is a part of China, and many even feel that we are defending another gallant free nation there instead of interfering in an unfinished civil war, as we are.

The basic policy and decisions we are defending today in South Vietnam are of course the policy and decisions made by Dulles in 1954 to sabotage the Geneva agreements and to create another point of confrontation with revolutionary communism on the Asian mainland.

The basic question, Mr. President, is not South Vietnam, but the policy underlying South Vietnam. Are we today going to maintain the course of the cold war, perhaps attempting to shift its focus from Russia to China, or are we going to seek a more fruitful course toward achieving peace and a modicum of freedom in the world?

Is there a more fruitful course? One danger always confronting a person who urges that we face honestly the facts of the cold war, and weigh and examine its value in achieving peace, economic progress and political freedom is that he will be accused of favoring communism. I am convinced in my heart that our almost blind and automatic dedication to the cold war and its continued military, diplomatic and other confrontations with not only communism but all types of revolutionary movements around the world, is furthering, rather than inhibiting communism. Likewise, it is driving us inexorably into another world war, this time with China. And it is depriving two-thirds of the human race of any real chance to solve the economic problems which confront them. This is tragedy on a scale unknown to mankind throughout history. It is tragedy which can be averted but only if we act now. There will be no next generation to correct our failures.

The cold war is at its center an ideological struggle. On our side we see it as a confrontation between our system of political and economic freedom and the Communist system of political and economic tyranny. The Communist side sees the struggle through a different set of glasses, in which they are seeking political and economic power for the masses through the overthrow of a system dominated by an all-powerful capitalist class. The views of neither side can survive close scrutiny by objective observers. Yet the struggle has developed into one having many of the aspects of a holy war, using all the symbols which generate emotional commitment without rational analysis.

Why is the cold war not inhibiting communism? Communism is the response of a desperate people to intolerable economic, social, and political conditions. It promises the destruction of the rich and rapid progress for the poor. When the world is predominantly poor and making little progress, its promises are a seductive call to the masses.

The cold war consumes \$200 billion per year in resources. By rough calculation,

the total income of the poorest two-thirds of mankind is also about \$200 billion per year. The money spent on the cold war prevents any solution to their problems. The present rate of economic development of the poor countries would, under the most optimistic conditions, double their per capita incomes every 30 years or so, or about every two generations, in these short-lived countries. In five generations, they might aspire to per capita incomes of \$200 or \$300 per year instead of their present \$50 or \$100 per year. That prospect is so hopeless that any call for revolutionary violence is met with enthusiasm by the masses. I believe that most Americans would react with the same revolutionary violence if confronted by the same problems. The violence in the ghettos is to some degree motivated by this same feeling of hopelessness for future progress.

Any victories we win in the poor countries of the world under these circumstances are meaningless. For a fleeting moment and at untold cost we hold back the flood. But the pressure will continue to increase until it is overwhelming. We are not responding to the problem. We are compounding it. What will prevent revolutionary violence? One thing only. Hope based on progress.

The poor countries of the world require, for a sufficient hope to inspire them, a rate of economic development that shows meaningful progress in each generation. Probably this means a rate of increase in GNP per capita of 8 to 10 percent per year instead of 2 to 3 percent. If this were translated into money, it would mean probably an infusion of an additional \$10 billion per year into their economic life, or 5 percent of what the cold war costs the people of the world. Of course, more than money is required. The other things include an end to wars and the threat of war, and dedication by the poor nations themselves to solving their own longstanding social and political problems. The greatest problem, that of population control, must be solved by their own efforts. Only then can they begin to solve the next most important problem of an adequate food supply.

The amount of money required to provide hope of progress to the poor nations is ridiculously small when measured against the demands of the cold war. Yet the pressures for even more cold war expenditures by the rich nations, fueled by the emotional fervor of ideological commitment, and backed by fantastically powerful industrial-military institutions, is immeasurably greater than the pressures seeking a solution to the real problems of humanity. Yet the pressures of revolutionary communism cannot be otherwise met.

This condition must be changed.

It can only be changed if the dialog of Vietnam can be translated into the dialog of human progress.

So I say to the President and Secretary Rusk, let us be done with trivialities and subterfuges. Let us make it clear that what is at stake is an effort to stem a vast revolutionary tide among the poor nations of the earth. Let us debate whether that tide can be stemmed by

FOIAb3b